

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communication: Amendment filed 1/09/08.

This action is made final.

2. Claims 1, 6-8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 22-24, 26, 27, 30, 31, 39-46 are pending in the case.

Claims 1, 10, 17, 26 and 27 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1, 6-8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 22-24, 26, 27, 30, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bauer (Pub No. US 2003/0197739 A1; hereinafter Bauer).**

As to claims 1, Bauer teaches:

A method of organizing at least one window on at least one computer monitor display (e.g., see Figs. 3, 4 and [0020]), the method comprising:

creating boundaries on the at least one computer monitor display, the boundaries forming a window area on the computer monitor display (e.g., see Figs. 3, 4 and [0023]);
saving the boundaries of the window area (e.g., see Figs. 3, 4 and [0025]);
associating a first window with the window area, wherein a first application executes within the first window (e.g., see [0025]);

Art Unit: 2179

automatically placing the first window within the window area in response to a first user input via a first function key (e.g., see [0029]; note in response to the activation of the F1 key, a word processing program is invoked and cover 50% of the display area; further note that list of applications are defined to be invoked in response to a function key can be as few as one application, see [0031]); and

automatically changing the size of the first window within the window area in response to a second user input via a second function key, such that the first window has a first predetermined aspect ratio that decreases at least one dimension of the first window, but still allows a user to view at least a portion of the first application executing within the first window (e.g., see [0029]; note in response to the activation of the F2 key, the word processing program window is changed to cover 40% of the display area; further note that the display windows can be configured to distributed vertically, horizontally or any other arrangement, see [0025]), wherein:

prior to changing the size of the first window, the first window occupies a first portion of the window area (e.g., prior to activation the F2 key, the word processing program window occupies 50% of the display area, see [0029]), and

in response to the second user input via the second function key, the first window is sized to occupy a second portion of the window area (e.g., in response to the activation of the F2 key, the word processing program window occupies 40% of the display area, see [0029]).

In regard to claims 10 and 26, claims 10 and 26 reflect the system-comprising a processor, a computer monitor, a user interface coupled to the processor for performing the method steps as claimed in claim 1, and are rejected along the same rationale (e.g., see Bauer Fig. 1, [0015]-[0019]).

In regard to claim 17, claim 17 reflects the computer readable medium-comprising software instruction for performing the method steps as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale (e.g., see Bauer Fig. 1, [0037]).

In regard to claim 27, claim 27 reflects reflect the computer-based system-comprising a processor, a computer monitor, a user interface coupled to the processor for performing the method steps as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale (e.g., see Bauer Fig. 1, [0037]) including the following:

a processing element for causing at least one window to be displayed on the display, wherein first window shape and first window placement are dependent on the user-defined window area in which the first window is positioned (e.g., see Figs. 3, 4 and [0025], [0029]).

As to claims 6 and 22, Bauer further teaches moving at least one of the boundaries of the window area (e.g., see Figs. 3, 4 and [0025], [0029]).

As to claims 7, 14, 23, and 30, Bauer further teaches adjusting a size of the window area (e.g., see Figs. 3, 4 and [0028], [0029]).

As to claims 8, 15, 24 and 31, Bauer teaches adjusting a shape of a window area (e.g., see Figs. 3, 4 and [0028], [0029]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2179

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bauer.

As to claims 39, 41, 43, and 45, Bauer teaches that the list of applications are defined to be invoked in response to a function key can be as few as one application (e.g., see [0031]). The display windows can be configured to distributed vertically, horizontally or any other arrangement in response to a function key (e.g., see [0025]). There are other configuration including but not limited to the two configuration for function keys F1 and F2 (e.g., see [0025], [0029]). Bauer does not teach a third function key to invoke the second window and a fourth function key to change the size of the second window. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to try these limitations in view of express suggestion in Bauer for the predictable results of enabling multiple windows are simultaneously displayed (e.g., see [0020]).

As to claims 40, 42, 44, and 46, Bauer further teaches the at least a portion of the first application executing within the first window and the at least a portion of the second

Art Unit: 2179

application executing within the second window are simultaneously visible to the user (e.g., see Figs. 3, 4 and [0029]).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's remarks filed on 01/09/08 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Art Unit: 2179

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TuyetLien (Lien) T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-270-1033. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday: 7:30 - 5:00 (every other Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TuyetLien T Tran/
Examiner, Art Unit 2179

/Weilun Lo/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2179